arXiv:1001.4316v1 [cond-mat.other] 25 Jan 2010

Ginzburg-Landau theory of superfluidity near absolute zero

Mohammad Mehrafarin

Physics Department, Amirkabir University of Technology, Tehran 15914, Iran[*]

Abstract

Due to strong interactions between superfluid particles, many particles are not in the condensate near absolute zero. In nonequilibrium situations produced under external stirring, they contribute to the flow via their induced average macroscopic motion. We present a modification of the Bose condensate model that considers this induced internal motion. Specifically, we show that the velocity field of the internal motion acts as a gauge field with which the condensate interacts, thereby coupling the applied vorticity to the superflow. The resulting Ginzburg-Landau-like model predicts the flow phenomena observed near absolute zero, in particular, transition to turbulence.

PACS numbers: 67.10.Jn,03.75.Kk,47.37.+q,74.20.De

---

[*] Electronic address: mehrafar@aut.ac.ir

I. INTRODUCTION

A proper description of superfluid hydrodynamics must account for transition to turbulent flow. Turbulent excitations, in general, are generated by external 'stirring' mechanisms that produce vorticity. They occur in the superfluid component in the form of atomically thin vortex filaments of quantized strength, a complex tangle of which forms the turbulent state.

At $T \approx 0$, the fundamental microscopic theory of superfluids, based on many-body quantum mechanics, is difficult to use to study flow phenomena. The macroscopic model of a weakly interacting Bose condensate provides a simpler approach. It captures some essential physics of superfluids, in particular, the structure of the vortex lines. Continuum mechanical equations of superfluidity are usually built on the assumption that the condensate model gives the exact description at zero temperature [1]. The main drawback of this model, however, is that superfluid is a liquid and not a dilute gas. Because of strong particle interactions, a large number of superfluid particles are not in the condensate at $T \approx 0$ [2] and these contribute to the flow in nonequilibrium situations. We refer to these excited particles as the zero-point cloud, to be distinguished from the thermal cloud (normal fluid) at finite temperatures. Our basic aim is to rectify this drawback by a modification of the condensate model that considers the contribution of the zero-point cloud. We show that in nonequilibrium situations produced under external stirring, an average macroscopic motion of the cloud is induced; whose velocity field provides a new degree of freedom for the liquid. This velocity acts as a gauge field with which the condensate particles interact, entailing a gauge coupling between the interpenetrating flows of the condensate and the cloud. The applied vorticity, thus, couples to the superflow in a gauge-field manner by means of inducing macroscopic internal vorticity via the cloud. The resulting model coincides with the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) model of superconductivity [3] in the superconductive phase, and explains the peculiar similarity between the latter and superfluid hydrodynamics, in particular transition to turbulent flow.

II. THE EQUILIBRIUM CONDENSATE MODEL

In the standard condensate model, the large number of condensate bosons per unit volume, n_0, gives rise to a collective irrotational velocity field, $\mathbf{v}_0 = \nabla\phi$, for the condensate, which corresponds to the superfluid velocity. The macroscopic wave function of the condensate is given by $\psi = \sqrt{n_0}\exp(im\phi/\hbar)$, where m is the boson mass. For a condensate of bosons interacting via a delta-function repulsive potential of strength g, the equilibrium energy is given by the Gross-Pitaevskii energy functional [4]

$$\begin{aligned} E_0[\psi,\psi^\star] &= \int d^3x\, \left(\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}|\nabla\psi|^2 - \mu|\psi|^2 + \frac{g}{2}|\psi|^4\right) \\ &= \int d^3x\, \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(\nabla\sqrt{n_0})^2 - \mu n_0 + \frac{g}{2}{n_0}^2 + \frac{1}{2}mn_0(\nabla\phi)^2\right] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\mu > 0$ is the chemical potential near absolute zero. The field equation that follows from minimization of this functional (the time-independent Gross-Pitaevskii equation) possesses vortex line solutions (see e.g. [4]); the core being an atomically thin hole surrounded by a macroscopic region of irrotational flow. Thus, under external stirring, formation of vortex lines becomes favorable in appropriate flow geometries and the superfluid can lower its total energy by creating inhomogeneity in the flow, concentrating vorticity along highly localized regions.

The Goldstone mode associated with the spontaneous breaking of the global gauge symmetry of (1) corresponds to the long-wavelength perturbations of the velocity potential. It plays the main part in the excitation spectrum near absolute zero. The liquid in the (sound) wave moves irrotationally with velocity given by the gradient of the perturbation field. Evidently, such a long-wavelength mode cannot exist in a disordered state, which renders the model inadequate for the description of turbulent flow. However, as we shall see, with the appearance of additional interactions in nonequilibrium situations, the long-wavelength excitations become costly and the Goldstone mode disappears. This is where gauge potential enters, as we explain in the sequel. As an inspiration, we first remark below the intriguing correspondence between superfluidity and superconductivity.

A. Superfluidity versus superconductivity

As for classical fluids, a superfluid undergoes transition from laminar to turbulent flow with or without intermediate mixed (vortex) flows, depending on the flow geometry. Examples of these are the cylindrical vessel (or Couette) flow and pipe flow, respectively (see [6] and the references therein). In the superfluid vessel flow, as long as the angular velocity of the rotating vessel is below a first critical value Ω_1, the fluid remains stationary. The intermediate mixed flow forms when the angular velocity is increased above Ω_1, with the superfluid breaking into an ordered array of vortex lines that are aligned along the rotation axis. Above a second critical angular velocity Ω_2 ($> \Omega_1$), the vortex flow develops into a turbulent flow in which quantum vortices invade the whole fluid by forming a chaotic tangle. In pipe flow, however, turbulent flow sets in when the superfluid velocity exceeds a critical value and there is no intermediate mixed flow. Except for the formation of vortex lines, the condensate model can explain none of these hydrodynamic behaviors.

The intriguing correspondence of the situation here with that in superconductivity is inspiring for our gauge-field description. External stirring agents weaken the ability of a flow to remain laminar, just as external currents weaken the ability of a metal/alloy to be superconductive. In both examples above, expulsion of the applied vorticity from the liquid interior corresponds to the Meissner effect, which occurs below a critical value of the applied magnetic field. The effect breaks down when the applied vorticity is too large. The ensuing flow can be divided into two types according to how this breakdown occurs, which is determined by the flow geometry. The flow types correspond to types I superconductivity and II. The array of vortices in the mixed superfluid vessel flow corresponds to the Abrikosov lattice of magnetic flux lines. The latter forms the mixed state of type II superconductors when the magnetic field lies between two critical values. If the field increases even more, the flux lines will invade the whole sample and superconductivity will be lost. In type I superconductivity, which corresponds to the pipe flow, this happens when the external field exceeds a critical value and there is no intermediate mixed state.

III. GAUGE INTERACTION AND THE GINZBURG-LANDAU MODEL

In an imperfect Bose gas, the fraction of particles in the condensate is not unity. This fraction is even smaller in the case of a Bose liquid with strong particle interactions [2]. That is, the densities of the condensate (mn_0) and of the superfluid are not the same. However, the superfluid velocity is the same as the condensate velocity, $\mathbf{v}_0$, which is determined by the condensate particles alone. The particles in the cloud do not act cooperatively and, hence, their atomic momenta cannot contribute to the collective irrotational flow. Nonetheless, they do give rise to effective atomic currents, the current density of which is a rapidly fluctuating quantity. This entails velocity fields that vary appreciably on the atomic scale of dimensions, the average of which over a macroscopic volume only being pertinent. Physically, in view of the randomness of these velocity fields, one expects zero average and hence no net macroscopic velocity contribution. But what if the cloud particles are subject to external stirring? To still suppose that the induced motions are completely random and not correlated with the applied vorticity is counterintuitive. In nonequilibrium situation established under the influence of external stirring, an average internal motion must be induced and, in fact, this is how the external vorticity couples to the superflow. The condensate model does not take this coupling into account, which renders it inadequate for a proper description of flow phenomena, in particular, turbulence. Let us, therefore, envisage that the externally induced microscopic motion of the large number of cloud particles, each with its atomic momentum, gives rise to an average macroscopic internal velocity field $\mathbf{V}$. (This is analogous to the induced internal magnetization due to effective atomic currents that result from an applied magnetic field, and does not entail cooperative behavior, of course.) The velocity fields $\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{v}_0$ are regarded as independent variables so that the liquid is endowed with a new degree of freedom. Such a treatment corresponds to nonequilibrium situations produced by external stirring mechanisms. (At finite temperatures, too, it forms the basis of the two-fluid model, wherein $\mathbf{V}$ pertains to the thermal cloud.) Thus, the center of mass of the condensate, in a local volume, moves relative to that of the interpenetrating cloud within with velocity $\nabla\phi - \mathbf{V}$. Taking into account the local 'rigid-body' rotation associated with the cloud vorticity $\nabla \times \mathbf{V}$, too, the kinetic energy density of the flow is, therefore,

$$\frac{1}{2}\, m n_0 (\nabla\phi - \mathbf{V})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\, k (\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2.$$

Here k is a parameter (with dimensions of moment of inertia per unit volume), which should depend on the macroscopic geometry of the flow. The above modifies the Gross-Pitaevskii energy functional (1) via its last term, according to

$$\begin{aligned} E[\psi, \psi^\star, \mathbf{V}] &= \int d^3x \,\left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(\nabla\sqrt{n_0})^2 - \mu n_0 + \frac{g}{2}{n_0}^2 + \frac{1}{2}\, m n_0 (\nabla\phi - \mathbf{V})^2 + \frac{1}{2}\, k(\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2\right] \\ &= \int d^3x \,\left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}|(\nabla - i\frac{m}{\hbar}\mathbf{V})\psi|^2 - \mu|\psi|^2 + \frac{g}{2}|\psi|^4 + \frac{1}{2}\, k(\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2\right]. \qquad (2) \end{aligned}$$

This GL-like functional is invariant under local gauge transformations

$$\mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V} + \nabla\Lambda, \quad \psi \to \psi\, e^{im\Lambda/\hbar}.$$

The induced velocity $\mathbf{V}$ of the zero-point cloud, thus, plays the role of a gauge field with which the condensate particles interact, entailing a gauge interaction between the flows of the condensate and the cloud. In other words, the applied vorticity couples to the superflow in a gauge-field manner by means of inducing macroscopic internal vorticity $\nabla \times \mathbf{V}$ via the cloud. The disruption of the superflow by external vorticity is like the disruption of supercurrents by external magnetic fields.

The field equations that follow from minimization of (2) are the well-known GL equations

$$\begin{gathered} -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(\nabla - i\frac{m}{\hbar}\mathbf{V})^2\psi + g|\psi|^2\psi = \mu\psi \\ k\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{V} = \frac{i\hbar}{2}(\psi\nabla\psi^\star - \psi^\star\nabla\psi) - m\mathbf{V}|\psi|^2 \end{gathered} \tag{3}$$

which replace the Gross-Pitaevskii equation of the standard condensate model. Their solution subject to the flow conditions, in principle, determine ψ and $\mathbf{V}$ for the flow. Note that in the zero-temperature limit we are considering, only the configuration of minimum energy contributes to the partition integral

$$Z = \int d[\psi]d[\psi^\star]d[\mathbf{V}]\ \Phi[\mathbf{V}]\mathrm{exp}\left(-\frac{1}{k_B T}E[\psi, \psi^\star, \mathbf{V}]\right) \tag{4}$$

where the functional $\Phi[\mathbf{V}]$ is a gauge fixing factor [5]. (It restricts the $\mathbf{V}$-integrals to the physical values of the field $\mathbf{V}$ and thus renders these integrals finite. Φ can be chosen from a variety of the gauge fixing factors (corresponding to the transverse (Landau) gauge, the Feynman gauge or the axial gauge for example), but the result will be independent of that choice, of course.) Hence, the GL equations (3) can be considered exact here.

It should be mentioned that the above GL functional has been already derived by Chelaflores [7], who adopts the term "depletion" for the non-condensate fraction [8]. In his derivation, he merely demands local gauge invariance for the Gross-Pitaevskii energy functional and identifies the emerging gauge field with the depletion velocity. However, he gives no physical justification. Moreover, the depletion velocity is not correlated with external agents and there is no mention of the source of this net macroscopic current (the microscopic motions may be random after all, with no net current). Needless to say, without such physical ingredients the model cannot be applied to the study of superfluid turbulence.

IV. TRANSITION TO TURBULENCE

The new gauge-field model of zero-temperature superfluidity, defined by the energy functional (2), thus, coincides with the GL model of superconductivity in the superconductive phase. This explains the peculiar similarity, discussed above, between the two phenomena. Since $\mu > 0$, the spontaneous breaking of the local gauge symmetry of (2) results in the Higgs mode. The Goldstone mode of the condensate model has transformed, giving way to a finite penetration depth for the induced internal velocity $\mathbf{V}$ and its vorticity field $\nabla \times \mathbf{V}$. The exclusion of the interior vorticity, which occurs below a critical stirring force, is just the superfluid Meissner effect. The Meissner effect breaks down when the applied vorticity is too large. Superfluid flow can be divided into two classes according to how this breakdown occurs. This is determined by the GL parameter of the model $\kappa = \sqrt{gk}/2\hbar$, which gives the relative strength of the short-range and gauge interaction terms, according to $\kappa < 1/\sqrt{2}$ (type I flow) or $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$ (type II flow). Thus, the flow types depend (through k) on the geometry of the flow, which is reconciling. In type I flows (such as the pipe flow), laminar flow is abruptly destroyed when the strength of the applied stirring force rises above a critical value. In type II flows (such as the vessel flow), raising the applied vorticity above a first critical value leads to an intermediate mixed flow, in which an increasing amount of vorticity penetrates the superfluid through arrays of quantized vortices. At a second critical value, laminar flow is destroyed.

To see how the above scenario for transition to turbulence arises, we apply the GL equations (3) to a superfluid subject to external stirring. It is more convenient to start with a turbulent system and study the transition to laminar superflow flow instead. For sufficiently strong stirring, laminar superflow is destroyed. If we continuously decrease the applied vorticity, at a certain critical value, superflow begins to form. Two situations arise according to the two distinct solutions of the GL equations:

(i) A condensate phase ($\psi \neq 0$) appears abruptly in the bulk of the fluid, where $|\psi|$ is the same at all points. Working in the gauge ψ =Real, the GL equations read:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\psi + \frac{1}{2}mV^2\psi + g\psi^3 &= \mu\psi \\ k\nabla \times \nabla \times \mathbf{V} &= -m\mathbf{V}\psi^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For ψ = const., these imply the solution $\mathbf{V} = 0$, $\psi = \sqrt{\mu/g}$ corresponding to a complete expulsion of vorticity in the bulk. However, boundary effects are important here. Near the boundary, $\mathbf{V}$ and ψ are no longer constant. Using $\psi = \sqrt{\mu/g}$ as a zeroth approximation, equations (5) yield $\nabla \cdot \mathbf{V} = 0$ and we obtain the London-like equation

$$\lambda^2 \nabla^2 \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}$$

where $\lambda = \sqrt{gk/\mu m}$ is the penetration length for the induced velocity/vorticity. The London equation explains the Meissner effect. The magnitude of the induced vorticity can be taken to be 2Ω, where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is the applied angular velocity. This is valid because the superflow is weak near the boundary and the resulting corrections to the vorticity are, therefore, negligible. The induced cloud velocity near the boundary, then, has a magnitude $V = \Omega\lambda$. Since $\frac{1}{2}mV^2 < \mu$ (by equations (5)), we obtain a critical value, Ω_c, for the applied angular velocity according to

$$\Omega < \Omega_c = \sqrt{\frac{2\mu^2}{gk}}.$$

As we decrease the applied angular velocity, Meissner effect takes place at Ω_c.

(ii) A condensate phase appears in the bulk of the fluid by spontaneous nucleation of condensate regions. In regions where nucleation occurs, superflow is just beginning to appear and, therefore, $|\psi|$ is small. The GL equations can be linearized to give

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}(\nabla - i\frac{m}{\hbar}\mathbf{V})^2\psi = \mu\psi \tag{6}$$

Also we can set $\nabla \times \mathbf{V} = 2\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Here, this is valid because the current density of the condensate is of the order of $|\psi|^2$ and the resulting corrections to the vorticity are, therefore, negligible in the linear approximation. The above equation is, then, formally identical to the Shrödinger equation for a charged particle in a uniform magnetic field. Let us ignore boundary effects here, and consider an infinite domain. A condensate phase corresponding to an eigensolution of (6) has an eigenvalue

$$\mu = \frac{1}{2}mv_z^2 + (2n+1)\hbar\Omega \tag{7}$$

where n is a nonnegative integer. It describes a particle with a constant velocity v_z along $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ and moving in a circle in the xy plane with angular frequency Ω. Therefore, the condensate phase which appears, in view of (7), for angular velocities $\Omega < \Omega_2 = \mu/\hbar$, does not correspond to a complete expulsion of vorticity.

In terms of the GL parameter, $\Omega_2 = \kappa\sqrt{2}\Omega_c$. When $\kappa < 1/\sqrt{2}$, we have $\Omega_2 < \Omega_c$ so that if we decrease Ω we first meet Ω_c at which Meissner effect takes place. This corresponds to type I flows. On the other hand when $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$, since $\Omega_2 > \Omega_c$, the condensate phase does not correspond to Meissner expulsion for $\Omega_c < \Omega < \Omega_2$. What we obtain here is that vorticity penetrates the bulk in the form of a dense array of quantized vortex lines, just as in superconductivity. This corresponds to type II flows.

V. THE WEAK-COUPLING LIMIT: LAMINAR FLOW

For sufficiently weak stirring, the coupling of the induced internal vorticity to the superflow is weak and the flow is expected to be laminar. Corroboratively indeed, under this circumstance the two flows decouple and their gauge interaction reduces to an effective (long-range) Biot-Savart interaction among the condensate particles *alone*. This can be shown as follows. We rewrite the energy functional (2) as

$$E = \int d^3x \left[\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} |\nabla\psi|^2 + (\frac{1}{2} m V^2 - \mu)|\psi|^2 + \frac{g}{2}|\psi|^4 + \frac{1}{2}\, k(\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2 - \mathbf{j}_0 \cdot \mathbf{V} \right] \tag{8}$$

where

$$\mathbf{j}_0 = \frac{i\hbar}{2}(\psi \nabla \psi^\star - \psi^\star \nabla \psi)$$

is the current density of the condensate. Under sufficiently weak stirring, such that $\frac{1}{2} m V^2 \ll \mu$, (8) reduces to

$$E = E_0 + \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}\, k(\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2 - \mathbf{j}_0 \cdot \mathbf{V} \right] \tag{9}$$

where E_0 is given by (1), of course. The gauge invariance is preserved because of the conservation of current density of the superflow ($\nabla \cdot \mathbf{j}_0 = 0$), which follows from the field equations derived from (9). Since entropy is fixed at $T \approx 0$, the energy required by the condensate to exchange a particle with the cloud is given by its chemical potential μ. The condition $\frac{1}{2} m V^2 \ll \mu$, therefore, expresses that the induced kinetic energy of the cloud particles is not sufficient to disrupt the condensate by causing particle exchange, justifying the condensate current conservation. The two flows hence uncouple, which mathematically follows from substituting (9) in (4) and integrating out the gauge field $\mathbf{V}$ from the partition function, according to [5]

$$\int d[\mathbf{V}]\ \Phi[\mathbf{V}] \exp\left\{ -\frac{1}{k_B T} \int d^3x \left[\frac{1}{2}\, k(\nabla \times \mathbf{V})^2 - \mathbf{j}_0 \cdot \mathbf{V} \right] \right\}$$
$$\propto \exp\left[\frac{1}{k_B T} \frac{1}{8\pi k} \int d^3x \int d^3x' \, \frac{\mathbf{j}_0(\mathbf{x}) \cdot \mathbf{j}_0(\mathbf{x}')}{|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}'|} \right].$$

The result is

$$Z = \int d[\psi]d[\psi^\star]\mathrm{exp}\left(-\frac{1}{k_B T}E[\psi,\psi^\star]\right)$$

where

$$E[\psi,\psi^\star] = E_0[\psi,\psi^\star] - \frac{1}{8\pi k}\int d^3x \int d^3x' \, \frac{\mathbf{j}_0(\mathbf{x})\cdot\mathbf{j}_0(\mathbf{x}')}{|\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|} \tag{10}$$

is the effective energy. Again, the configuration of minimum energy only counts. Thus, under sufficiently weak stirring and as a by-effect of flow decoupling, there emerges a long-range Biot-Savart interaction between the condensate particles in addition to their short-range interaction. To minimize (10), the Biot-Savart term enforces local parallel ordering of currents, which is necessary to maintain laminar flow. Moreover, it may happen that vortex lines form, as mentioned before, to minimize E_0, in which case the Biot-Savart term favors their parallel ordering. This is possible only in appropriate geometries (corresponding to $\kappa > 1/\sqrt{2}$) and explains the laminar vortex phase of type II flows. The Biot-Savart interaction between vortex lines is well-known in the context of the vortex filament model [9]. Its automatic appearance here, as a by-effect of the induced gauge-field flow, is a corroborating feature of the model.

To undergo transition to turbulent flow, the internal gauge flow must not decouple. The role of its induced vorticity is indispensable in destroying laminar flow, just as superconductivity is destroyed by induced internal magnetization.

VI. RECAPITULATION

Due to strong interactions between superfluid particles, the fraction of particles in the zero-point cloud is large. When externally agitated, they contribute to the macroscopic flow via their induced average motion. Indeed, it is through the excitation of these internal motions that the applied vorticity couples to the superfluid. The internal relative motion of the flows of the cloud and the condensate defines a new degree of freedom, which is the essence of superfluidity in the zero-temperature limit. It entails a gauge coupling between the two interpenetrating flows and results in a GL-like model. The applied vorticity, thus, couples to the superflow in a gauge-field manner by means of inducing internal vorticity via the cloud. For sufficiently weak stirring, the applied vorticity cannot disrupt the condensate and the two flows decouple. The ensuing flow is a laminar flow of the condensate, where, as a by-effect of decoupling, a Biot-Savart interaction emerges between the condensate particles in addition to their self-interaction. Here, two types of laminar flow may generally form: (i) The external vorticity is expelled from the fluid interior by the Meissner effect. The Biot-Savart interaction enforces local parallel ordering of currents and, thus, maintains laminar flow. (ii) The vorticity penetrates the fluid via formation of quantized vortices. The Biot-Savart interaction enforces parallel ordering of the vortex lines and, thus, forms vortex flow. The condition under which the second flow type is possible is determined by the GL parameter of the model, which, corroboratively, depends on the flow geometry. Finally, when the stirring is strong, the two flows are fully coupled and the laminar superflow is destroyed by the internal vorticity of the cloud.

[1] P. H. Roberts and N. G. Berloff in: *Quantized vortex dynamics and superfluid turbulence*, Ed. C. F. Barenghi, R. J. Donnelly and W. F. Vinen, Lecture notes in physics, Vol. 571 (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 2001).

[2] E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics*, Part 2, Ch. 3 (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1981).

[3] P. G. de Gennes, *Superconductivity of metals and alloys* (Perseus Books, United States, 1999).

[4] H. Kleinert, *Gauge fields in condensed matter physics*, Vol. 1, Part II, Ch. 1 (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).

[5] H. Kleinert, *ibid.* Part I, Ch. 3.

[6] C. F. Barenghi, Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A **335**, 2025 (1997).

[7] J. Chelaflores, J. Low Temp. Phys. **21**, 307 (1975).

[8] I would like to thank Professor S. Fauve for bringing this work to my attention.

[9] K. W. Schwarz, Phys. Rev. B **38**, 2398 (1988).